

PHILOLOGUS

Zeitschrift für antike Literatur und ihre Rezeption

BAND 157

2013 · Heft 1

Sonderdruck



Akademie Verlag

INHALT

	Seite
Editorial	3
ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS, An Unnoticed Testimonium to the Hesiodic <i>Melampodia</i> ? PSI 14. 1398 and [Hesiod] <i>Melampodia</i> fr. 276 M-W (= 212 Most)	5
MARCO CATRAMBONE, Toante e il Coro: nota a Eur. <i>IT</i> 1490–1	16
LAURA CARRARA, Per una nuova interpretazione di Aristia, TrGF 9 F 1	35
ELENI PACHOUMI, The Religious-Philosophical Concept of Personal Daimon and the Magico-Theurgic Ritual of Systasis in the Greek Magical Papyri	46
TATJANA ALEKNIENE, Les dérivés préfixaux du verbe ἀπλόω dans les écrits de la tradi- tion platonicienne après Plotin	70
HAROLD MATTINGLY, The Lex Repetundarum of the Tabula Bembina	87
PAOLA GAGLIARDI, L' <i>ecl.</i> 1 e l' <i>ecl.</i> 10 di Virgilio: Considerazioni su un rapporto com- plesso	94
ANDREAS HEIL, <i>Maronis mentula</i> : Vergil als Priapeen-Dichter bei Martial (<i>Mart.</i> 9, 33)	111
JENS-OLAF LINDERMANN, Varro und Isidor in den Gromatici veteres	119
ERIK BOHLIN, On the Geometrical Term <i>Radius</i> in Ancient Latin	141
WOLFGANG STROBL, Das Zwölftafelgesetz und die Bestattung des Misenus in Vergils <i>Aeneis</i> (6, 176–231). Zu einem Deutungsversuch des Domizio Calderini	154

Miszellen

ANTONIO DITTADI, Euripide o Epicarmo? A proposito di una controversia testimoni- anza sull' "Antiope" nell' <i>or.</i> 2 <i>Behr</i> di Elio Aristide	176
STEFANO ROCCHI, Un ritocco a Fest. P. 274	182
REINHOLD F. GLEI/BURKHARD REIS, 'Grammatisches' vs. 'Rhetorisches' Übersetzen: Zum nicht erhaltenen Original eines Ciceroverse (FPL 55)	183
RAINER JAKOBI, Ps.-Augustinus über <i>memoria</i> und <i>pronuntiatio</i>	194

Philologus	157	2013	1	46–69
------------	-----	------	---	-------

ELENI PACHOUMI

THE RELIGIOUS-PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPT OF PERSONAL DAIMON AND THE MAGICO-THEURGIC RITUAL OF SYSTASIS IN THE GREEK MAGICAL PAPYRI

Introduction

The paper looks at the concept of *personal daimon* in the Greek magical papyri. The concept is examined in relation to Greek philosophy from the Pre-Socratics to Socrates' daimonion, to Plato and to the Stoic and Neo-Platonist philosophers. Questions to be addressed are: What is the nature of the personal daimon? What is the relationship between the personal daimon and the individual and how is this relationship established? Particular emphasis is paid to the role of the magico-theurgic ritual of systasis in the process of establishing a relationship with the personal daimon. Other questions also to be examined are: What is the relationship between magic ritual, as displayed in the Greek magical papyri, and philosophy? Do the spells reflect a tension towards ritualizing religio-philosophic beliefs, or does the contemporary philosophy of the Neo-Platonists reveal a tension towards philosophizing ritual texts? The concept of personal daimon is also examined in relation to the mystery rituals, focusing on the issue of internalization of the personal daimon and the association between the knowledge of the divine and the self-knowledge of the individuals.

The PGM¹ spells

I shall examine the issue of personal daimon focusing on four *PGM* spells: (a) Σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος (VII. 505–528, A. D. III/IV), (b) the untitled spell for dream revelation (VII. 478–490, A. D. III/IV), (c) the untitled spell concerning your own shadow (III. 612–631, A. D. IV) and (d) the “Binding erotic spell of Astrapsoukos” (VIII. 1–63, A. D. IV/V).

¹ *PGM* is the abbreviation of *Papyri Graecae Magicae*. The edition used in this paper is Preisendanz and Henrichs (1973–1974). Unless otherwise stated, all references given in the form of Roman numerals followed by Arabic numerals are *PGM* references.

(a) Σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος (VII. 505–528). Two important issues should be discussed in this spell in relation to its title and content. First is the reference to ἴδιος δαίμων. We are dealing with a daimon² in the sense of personal daimon, often described in terms like these here. For example, the exact term ἴδιος δαίμων is also used in the *Commentary on the Letter Ω* by Zosimus of Panopolis, who was a famous alchemist of the fourth century A. D. in Egypt³. The close alternative οἰκεῖος (personal) δαίμων is used by the Neo-Platonist Porphyry⁴. Iamblichus also in book IX on the personal daimon of *De Mysteriis* refers to the personal daimon both as ἴδιος and οἰκεῖος and also as ὁ ἑαυτοῦ δαίμων⁵. Iamblichus, investigating “how the *oikodespotes/master of the house* bestows him (the personal daimon)” to the individuals (πῶς μὲν ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης αὐτὸν δίδωσι) and “about the discovery of the *oikodespotes*, whether it is possible, or impossible” (καὶ περὶ εὐρέσεως τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότη, εἴτε ἀδύνατός ἐστιν εἴτε δυνατή, Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 2. 274. 4–7)⁶. So, the epithet οἰκεῖος for the personal daimon should be related to *oikodespotes* and the *oikos*, which must refer to the region related to the zodiac sign of one’s birth. Other similar formulations go back to the Pre-Socratics, Plato and the Stoics⁷.

Our second point of discussion is the use of the term σύστασις. The term, often used in the Greek magical papyri, applies to the ritual and/or prayer for establishing a *connection* between a man and the divine, most often a god, or the personal daimon, or even a divine *assistant*, πάρεδρος⁸. Betz translates it as “meeting”⁹. The same trans-

² On *daimon(s)* see (among a vast scholarly literature) Hopfner (1974) 1–26; Eitrem (1950); Wilford (1965); Smith (1978) 425–39; Rutherford (1991) 215; Alt (2000) 219–52; on “Socrates’ Divine Sign” see also Destrée and Smith (2005).

³ *Herm. Zos. Alch. Com. Ω* .2; Scott (1924) 105; see also Dodds (1951) 304; on Zosimus of Panopolis see also Fowden (1993) 120 ff.

⁴ Porphy. *Plot.* 10. 18; see also 55 and nn. 58–59 below.

⁵ Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 1. 273. 1–3; IX. 3. 275. 2–3, 11; IX. 5. 279. 1; IX. 6. 280. 1; IX. 8. 282. 6; IX. 9. 283. 2, 9, 11; IX. 9. 284. 1, 2, 5, 6; and IX. 10. 285. 7.

⁶ See also Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 5. 279. 6–14, “εἴτε γὰρ δυνατόν εὐρεῖν τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην τῆς γενέσεως, ἔστι δῆπου καὶ ὁ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ διδόμενος δαίμων γνώριμος” and “ὅλως δὲ οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότης μόνου ἐνδίδεται, ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ εἰσιν ἀρχαὶ αὐτοῦ καθολικώτεραι ἢ κατὰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην”. (Note also Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 3. 276. 11–13, “ὅμως ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄστρον ἀπόρροια ἀπονέμει τὸν δαίμονα, ἂν τε ἡμεῖς γινώσκωμεν ἂν τε μή”. On the leader of the cosmocrators and the personal daimon see Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 9. 284. 2–5, “Ἀεὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ θεουργικῇ τάξει διὰ τῶν ὑπερεχόντων τὰ δευτέρα καλεῖται· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δαιμόνων τοίνυν εἰς κοινὸς ἡγεμόνων τῶν περὶ τὴν γένεσιν κοσμοκρατόρων καταπέμπει τοὺς ἰδίους δαίμονας ἐκάστος”). On οἰκουρός and οἰκοδεσπότης see also Pachoumi (2011a) 161–162 and n. 22.

⁷ Heraclit. *Fr.* 119 (rationalising version); Emp. *Fr.* 110. 18; E. *Fr.* 1018 (Anaxagoras); for Plato and Stoics see nn. 43–45 below.

⁸ See also LSJ; e.g. II. 43: συσταθῆς αὐτῷ and 73: συνίστα δὲ σεαυτὸν τῷ θεῷ οὕτως; III. 197: ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως ἥδε πρὸς Ἥλιον γιν[ομένη, 438–39: πᾶσα σύστασις τῆς ἱερᾶς συνθέσεως, 494: Σύστασις πρὸς Ἥλιον, 695: αἰτῶν σύστασιν τῇ τῷ θεοῦ and 698–99: ὅταν οὖν συσταθῆς τῷ θεῷ (see 56–57 below); IV. 168–69: πρῶτα μὲν συσταθῆς πρὸς τὸν Ἥλιον τρόπῳ τούτῳ, 209: σημεῖον ἔσται τῆς συστάσεως τότε, 215–16: συνεστάθην σου τῇ ἱερᾷ μορφῇ, 220–21: ἰσοθέου φύσεως κυριεύσας τῆς διὰ ταύτης τῆς συστάσεως ... (see 59 below), 261: σύστασις τῆς πράξεως, 778–79: ἡ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ σύστασις ἐστὶν ἥδε, 930–31: σύστασις, ἣν πρῶτον λέγεις πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἡλίου; Va. 1–2: Ἦλιε ... Ζαγροῦλ, ἔχε με συνιστά-

lation is later followed by Martin in Betz's *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*¹⁰. Σύστασις is a term applied in theurgy¹¹. Lewy in the *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* translates it as "conjunction"¹². The translation of the term as "conjunction", or "connection" seems to be etymologically precise¹³ and fits in with the theurgical use of the term. Nevertheless, I do not mean to reject its interpretation as "meeting".

But how is the magico-theurgic ritual of systasis established in the spell? In the beginning of the invocation, the magician greets Tyche (VII. 506). Abstract deities like Tyche, Moirai, Time, or Aion are often invoked in the Greek magical papyri¹⁴. The personified abstract deity Tyche is elsewhere invoked individually or in association with *Daimon*, *Moirai*, or the Good Daimon and the good hour and day¹⁵.

The association between *Tyche* and related terms and *daimon* has a long philosophical history. Destiny and nature are described as *daimon* by the Pre-Socratic philosopher Empedocles¹⁶. In Plato's *Republic*, Necessity's daughters, the *Moirai*, are closely

μενον; VI. 1: (Γίνεται ἡ μὲν σύστασις αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἥλιον β'; 39: ὁμοίως καὶ πρὸς Σελήνην ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ σύστασις ἥδε; and XIII. 29: συνίστανου, 38: τῇ καθολικῇ συστάσει, 346: ἔχει δὲ σύστασιν, 378–79: ἐπικαλοῦ τὸν τῆς ὥρας καὶ τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας θεόν, ἵνα ἐξ αὐτῶν συσταθῇς, 611: σύστηρόν με and 927–31: διὸ συνίσταμαι σοι διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιστρατηγοῦ Μιχαήλ ... διὸ συνίσταμαι. In relation to πάρεδρος I. 57: λέγ[ε] τὴν τρώτην σύστασιν and 179–80: ἀέριον πνεῦμα συσταθὲν κραταιῷ παρῑδρῳ; note also the use of προσύστασις in III. 587–88: τὴν προσύσ[τ]ασιν. See also n. 25 below.

⁹ Betz (1981) 160–61.

¹⁰ Betz (1996) 131; but in the Glossary Betz uses a broader definition characterising it a technical term for: "a rite, or a prayer to establish association between a god and a person" (here, he gives the example of VII. 505 ff.); "a meeting ... to receive a revelation"; "a blessing"; "a union"; Betz (1996) 339.

¹¹ E.g. Iambl. *Myst.* III. 14. 132. 6, III. 14. 133. 14; Porph. *ad. Aneb.* 13. 2f. 1–5; Marin. *Procl.* 28; on theurgy and magic see Dodds (1951) 291 ff., Lewy (1978) 461–66; on theurgy and philosophy see Iambl. *Myst.* II. 11. 96. 11 ff., IX. 1; also 60 and n. 90 below; also see Dickie (2001) 208 ff.

¹² Lewy comments: "the term (σύστασις) derives from the current vocabulary of the magical science and applies to the 'conjunction' of a magician with a god or with one of his ministering spirits, called the 'assistant daimon' (δαίμων πάρεδρος), who aids the theurgist by granting him the superhuman powers required for the accomplishment of the magical act" and "The papyri frequently mention magical practices destined to bring about 'conjunction' (σύστασις) with a ministering spirit" (Lewy 1978, 228–29 and n. 3). The term indeed applies to gods and the *paredros* (e.g. I. 58) in the spells of the Greek Magical Papyri, as examined above (see n. 8 above). But, Lewy's definition of σύστασις fails to refer to the notion of the personal daimon in relation to systasis. In our spell the term is used for the connection with the personal daimon, which should not be confused with the concept of the divine assistant, *paredros*, as we shall see (58 below). On systasis see also Johnston (1997) 165–94.

¹³ From the verb συνίστημι; see LSJ.

¹⁴ E.g. I. 309, IV. 1169–70, 1205–6, XII. 246–7, XIII. 982, 994–95 etc.; see also n. 15 below. Note also Psellos' comment *In Oracula Chaldaica* on the truthfulness of abstract ("unshaped and unformed") conceptions in theurgy, "Εἰ δὲ ἴδοι τοῦτο ἀσχημάτιστον, καὶ ἀμόρφωτον, ἀνεξαπλάτητος ἔστω καὶ ὅπερ ἀν ἐκεῖθεν ἐρωτηθεῖη, ἀληθές ἐστιν ἄντικρυς" (PG. 122, 1136).

¹⁵ For the invocation of Tyche/ai see IV. 664–65, 3165–66, 2601, 2664, LVII. 18; for the association of Tyche with daimon see L. 3, 6 (recto); for Tyche/ai and Moirai XXI. 16, XII. 254–55, XIII. 781–82; for the Good Tyche and the Good Daimon VIII. 51; and for the Good Tyche and the Good Daimon in relation to the good hour and the good day see IV. 2999–3000.

¹⁶ Emp. *Fr.* 126. 4.

connected with the souls and the personal daimon. Plato describes the *personal daimon*, or the *chosen daimon*, as “the guardian of a man’s life” (φύλακα τοῦ βίου) and “the fulfiller of a man’s choices” (ἀποπληρωτὴν τῶν αἰρεθέντων)¹⁷. The Neo-Platonists echo and develop this teaching. For Plotinus, the personal daimon is “the fulfiller (ἀποπληρωτής) of what one has chosen”¹⁸. Similarly, Iamblichus refers to “the personal guardian daimon” in each person as “the fulfiller (ἀποπληρωτής) of the lives of the soul”¹⁹. Proclus also connects the personal daimon with each man’s destiny, presenting him as the one “who guides our whole life and fulfils (ἀποπληροῶν) the choices before birth, the allotments of destiny and of the gods who guide destiny”²⁰. In this way, Platonist philosophers seek to reconcile Tyche and Destiny with personal choice.

In our spell, the greeting of Tyche is followed by greetings of “the daimon of this place” (δαῖμον τοῦ τόπου τούτου), “the present hour” (ἐνεστῶσα ὥρα), “the present day” (ἐνεστῶσα ἡμέρα), and “every day” (πᾶσα ἡμέρα, VII. 506–7). The specification of the place, day and hour is very important in the magical spells and rituals. The magician invokes the deity to be revealed in a specific day, hour and place²¹; and practices the rituals in certain, usually purified, places²². In the introductory letter of Thessalos of Tralles’ astrological work *De Virtutibus Herborum* dated to the first or second century A. D., god said to the king Necepsos that he failed to obtain a prophecy from the gods about what he wanted to learn, because he didn’t know the correct “times and places” (τοὺς δὲ καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς τόπους) he should pick the plants²³.

The reference here to “the daimon of this place” is to the *genius loci*. Elsewhere in the Greek magical papyri, as for example in the untitled spell III. 1–164 the “daimon of the place” is invoked (III. 34). In the erotic spell IV. 1390–1495 also the dead unlucky heroes and heroines, “these of this place, of this day and of this hour” (IV. 1420–3) are called up. In another spell there is even a reference to “(on) the land of the whole cosmic place” (κατὰ γαῖαν τόπου ὅλου κοσμικοῦ, VII. 837–8).

The Hour or Hours are personified and deified in the Greek magical papyri²⁴. Invocations to the gods of Hours or Weeks we find in the spell XIII. 1–343 “A sacred book called ‘Monad’, or ‘Eighth Book of Moses’ about the holy name”, which is the first of the three different versions of the ‘Eighth Book of Moses’ included in XIII. 1–734. The magician here according to the ritual of “the universal connection”

¹⁷ Pl. *R.* 620d–621a; see also Betz (1981) 161.

¹⁸ Plot. *Enn.* III. 4. 5. 24–25.

¹⁹ Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 6. 280. 8–9. See also 53 and n. 49 below.

²⁰ Procl. *In Alc.* 77. 4–7.

²¹ E.g. III. 37–38, 77–78, IV. 544–45, 686–87, 1699–1700, V. 194–95; VII. 155–67 called “Days and Hours for divination”; for the role of astronomy in Egyptian rituals see Morenz (1992) 7–9.

²² E.g. II. 148, IV. 1926, VII. 844 and XIII. 6 ff.

²³ Thess. *Tral. Virt. Herb.* 27; see also Herm. *Zos. Alch. Com.* Ω. 3.

²⁴ III. 130, IV. 1050 and 3229.

(τῇ καθολικῇ συστάσει²⁵, XIII. 38) is instructed: “earlier get connected” (πρότερον συνιστάνου) “with the gods who beget the hours” (τοῖς ὥρογενέσιν θεοῖς, XIII. 29–31); and “you will be initiated to them” (τελεσθήσῃ δὲ αὐτοῖς, XIII. 31–2). The magician should also prepare three animal-faced figures from fine flour, cense and eat them, saying “the spell of the gods who beget the hours” (τὸν λόγον τῶν ὥρογενῶν), their compulsive spell and the names of “the gods set over the week” (τοὺς ἐφεβδομαπικτοὺς τεταγμένους)²⁶; and, as a result of that, “you (the magician) will have been initiated to them” (καὶ ἔσῃ (τε)τελεσμένος αὐτοῖς, XIII. 35–37). Hence the systasis is presented here as a mystic ritual and the magician as an initiated to the gods who beget the hours. The second version XIII. 343–645 included in XIII. 1–734 with the title “The holy, hidden book of Moses called ‘eighth’ or ‘holy’” also refers to the ritual systasis (e.g.: σύστασιν, XIII. 346), according to which the magician should “invoke the god of the hour and the day, so that you may be connected through them” (ἐπικαλοῦ τὸν τῆς ὥρας καὶ τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας θεόν, ἵνα ἐξ αὐτῶν συσταθῇς, XIII. 378–79). The language here, as in the previous spell, alludes to the mysteries, and the ritual of systasis is described as a mystical initiation of the magician with the personified and deified hours and days (e.g.: τέλεσόν με ... σύστησόν με, XIII. 610–11)²⁷. In the “Σύστασις πρὸς Ἡλίον” (III. 494–611) also the twelve different animal “forms”, “images” and magical names of Helios correspond respectively to the twelve hours of the day (III. 501–536).

Similarly in the *defixio* from Carthage in Africa the user of the spell adjures “the god of this day”, “the god who has the power of this hour”²⁸. The gods of time were often invoked in the Chaldaean theurgical rituals²⁹. Proclus refers to the invocations made by the Chaldaeans to personified gods and goddesses of Time, Month, Night and Day³⁰.

²⁵ Note also the use and meaning of ἐντυχία in the spell. The term is used here in the sense of *prayer* or *petition* (ἐπερεῖς τὴν ἐντυχίαν ταύτην, XIII. 135 and 695; also in IV. 1930); Preisendanz translates it “Gebet” (1974) 93 and Betz as “petition” (1986) 175. But ἐντυχία can also mean *meeting*. That double meaning of ἐντυχία as *prayer* and *meeting* allude to a similar double meaning of the term σύστασις as *connection* or *meeting* (see 47–48 and n. 8 above), and as *prayer* for connection (e.g.: σύστασις, ἣν πρῶτον λέγεις πρὸς ἀνατολὴν ἡλίου, IV. 930–31; λέγῃε τὴν πρῶτην σύστασιν, I. 57). Hence ἐντυχία could possibly be used as an alternative term of σύστασις in the spell (see also n. 66 below). On ἐντυχία see also in P. Duk. inv. 729, “ἐντυχίας πρὸς (Ἡλίον)” (28); Jordan (2006) 161, 163 and 171.

²⁶ See also XIII. 53–58: ὦν πρόλεγε τοὺς ὥρογενεῖς σὺν τῇ στήλῃ καὶ τοὺς ἡμερεσίους (καὶ) τοὺς ἐφεβδομαπικτοὺς τεταγμένους ... εἰ μὴ τὸν κύριον τῆς ἡμέρας προείπης καὶ τῆς ὥρας πικνότερον; repeated in 118–120, also in 378–381 and in 424–29.

²⁷ Also see XIII. 927–31: διὸ συνίσταμαι σοι διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιστρατηγοῦ Μιχαὴλ ... διὸ συνίσταμαι.

²⁸ Audollent (1904) 325 ff. Also on a Roman gold lamella dated to 98–117 AD a magical “Time God” is depicted; see Kotansky (1994) 118–20.

²⁹ Psel. *Daim.* c. 7; Lewy (1978) 229–30, esp. n. 9.

³⁰ Procl. *Tim.* III. 89. 17–19: ὀνόματά τε θεῖα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐκδιδούσα καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ἐνιαυτοῦ συστατικὰ καὶ κλήσεις καὶ αὐτοφανεῖας; also Procl. *Tim.* III. 32. 16–21: δευτέρον δὲ κοινῆς οὔσης ἐννοίας εἶναι τὰς Ὁρας θεὰς καὶ τὸν Μῆνα θεόν, ὧν καὶ ἱερὰ παρειλήφραμεν, καὶ Ἡμέραν καὶ Νύκτα θεὰς εἶναι φάμεν, ὧν καὶ κλήσεις ἔχομεν ἐκδεδομένας παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν, πολλὰ μᾶλλον ἀνάγκη τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεὸν καὶ μηνὸς καὶ ὥρων καὶ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὄντα περιλήπτικόν.

Next follows a greeting of τὸ περιέχον, which can be literally translated as “the encompassing” (VII. 507–8). This is a philosophical term widely used by different kinds of philosophers³¹. In the text, next to “the encompassing”, we see the epexegetic phrase “that is earth and heaven”. Similarly in Plato’s *Timaeus* the term is used to describe the Universe, “which embraces all intelligible living creatures”³².

After these greetings to Tyche, the *genius loci*, the Hour, Day and the abstract “encompassing”, comes the greeting to Helios, which is followed by an invocation to the god (VII. 508–21), in recognised “Du-Stil”³³. Each of the sentences addressed to Helios ends with magical names in Greek and Coptic³⁴. Helios is described as the one “who has in yourself the *mixture* of the cosmic nature” (ὁ ἔχων ἐν σεαυτῷ τὴν τῆς κοσμικῆς φύσεως σύγκρασιν, VII. 512). Close parallels to this description of Helios are found in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, in which there is a reference to “the entire cosmic mixture” (ἡ πᾶσα κοσμικὴ σύγκρασις, *Corp. Herm.* III. 4; also XI (ii). 7), and in the Neo-Platonist philosophy. Plotinus, for example, in *Ennead VI “On the Kinds of Being II”*, discussing the *genera* (γένη) identified with *principles* (ἀρχάς), says, “so, by mixing the *genera*, all of them together with each other, each with those under these, do we accomplish *the whole* and make *a mixture of everything?*” (ἄρα τὰ μὲν γένη, ἕκαστον μετὰ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτά, ὁμοῦ μινύοντες ἀλλήλοις τὰ πάντα, τὸ ὅλον ἀποτελοῦμεν καὶ σύγκρασιν ποιοῦμεν ἀπάντων; *Enn.* VI. 2. 2. 20–22)³⁵. Proclus also in “*In Platonis Timaeum Commentarii*” refers to “the mixture from all towards the implied creation, which exists on the whole” (ἡ ἐκ τῶν ὅλων σύγκρασις πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην δημιουργίαν ὀλικὴν ὑπάρχουσαν, Procl. *in Tim.* II. 268. 1–3)³⁶.

³¹ See LSJ; e.g. Parm. *Test.* 37–II 7, 1 (D. 335TM; vgl. 28 B 12): καὶ τὸ περιέχον δὲ πάσας <τείχους> δίκην στερεὸν ὑπάρχειν; Anaxag. *Fr.* 2. 1: καὶ γὰρ ἀήρ τε καὶ αἰθήρ ἀποκρίνονται ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ τοῦ περιέχοντος, καὶ τὸ γε περιέχον ἄπειρόν ἐστι τὸ πλῆθος; Emp. *Fr.* 57. 5: ὡς φερομένου τοῦ φωτός καὶ γιγνομένου ποτὲ μετὰ τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ περιέχοντος.

³² Pl. *Ti.* 31. 4; for its interpretation as “the environment” see Epicur. *Nat.* 79G and Plot. *Enn.* II. 3. 14; for its use as “the universal” opposed to τὰ περιεχόμενα, the individuals, see Arist. *Metaph.* 1023b 27.

³³ For the “Du-Stil” form in prayers see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 131.

³⁴ For the magical names Ορκορηθρα, Ζαραχθω and Thortcho in VII. 510–11 see Betz (1996) 132.

³⁵ Also Plot. *Enn.* VI. 3. 25. 9ff., “Εἰ δὲ σύγκρασιν τινα καὶ μίξιν σημαίνουσι καὶ κρασιν καὶ εἰς ἓν ἐξ ἐνὸς σύστασιν τὴν κατὰ τὸ συνίστασθαι γινόμενῃν, οὐ κατὰ τὸ συνεστάναι ἥδη” (Sleeman, Igal, H-S read “σύγκρασιν”, though Armstrong in the Loeb ed. (2000) reads “σύγκρισιν”); Plot. *Enn.* III. 3. 4. 49; also Porph. *VP.* XXXI. 9, “τὴν δὲ πασῶν ἅμα σύγκρασιν καὶ συμφωνίαν καὶ ὡσανεὶ σύνδεσμον, ἥσπερ ὡς ἀδίου τε καὶ ἀγενήτου μέρος ἐκάστη καὶ ἀπόρροια, Μνημοσύνην ὠνόμαζεν”; also Iambl. *Comm. Math.* p. 29. 1; Iambl. *Theol. Ar.* V. 18.

³⁶ See also Procl. *in Tim.* II. 297. 15; also Procl. *in Prm.* 777. 5–9, “Ἡ δὲ σύγκρασις τῶν εἰδῶν ἐμφαίνει τὴν κοινωνίαν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀδιάλεικτον καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν τὴν αἰὼν, ἴσως δὲ καὶ τὴν πηγαίαν αὐτῶν καὶ πρωτοφυγὸν ἐνδείκνυται φύσιν”; Procl. *in Prm.* 723. 29, 1051. 22–3; Procl. *Hier. Ar.* 150. 29–31, “διὸ τῇ μίξει τῶν πολλῶν ἐνίσχουσι τὰς προειρημένας ἀπορροίας καὶ ἐξομοιοῦσι τὸ ἐκ πάντων ἓν γενόμενον πρὸς ἐκεῖνο τὸ πρὸ τῶν πάντων ὅλον.”

Helios' character is described as follows, "you are the young one, of noble birth, descendant (ὁ νέος, εὐγενής, ἔγγονος) of the holy temple, kinsman (συγγενής) to the sacred lake called Abyss, which is located next to the two pedestals σκιαθι: καὶ μαντω; and the earth's four basements were shaken" (VII. 516–18). Bergman argues that the words σκιαθι and μαντω stand for the Egyptian solar barks, *mśkt.t* (Me-Sektet), the Night-bark, and *m'nd.t* (Manedjet), the Day-bark³⁷. The stem of the three epithets εὐγενής, ἔγγονος, συγγενής denotes birth, since all come from the verb γεννῶ³⁸. According to Bergman, the equivalent verb in Egyptian is *hpr* and the name of the Egyptian morning sun god of birth and existence is Khepri (*Hprj*)³⁹. Another evidence for the reference to Khepri is the address at the end of the spell "lord of all, holy Scarab" (VII. 519–20), since the god Khepri was depicted as a scarab⁴⁰. Khepri is similarly addressed as "the All-Lord" in a section of the Egyptian papyrus entitled "The beginning of the Book of overthrowing Apophis, the enemy of Re and the enemy of King Wen-nofer"⁴¹. The description as "the young one" also fits the characteristics of Khepri as the morning sun god⁴². Thus in Helios' various descriptions here the Egyptian influences prevail.

Before we go back to our initial question of how the ritual of systasis is established, it is worth observing that the divine entities that the magician greets in the spell are all external, as we have seen in the greetings of the *genius loci*, the personified deities of Hour and Day, the abstract *encompassing* and Helios. But how is the personal daimon conceived in relation to individuals in Greek philosophy? Is it described in the philosophical treatises as an external or internal deity? In *Timaeus* Plato relates the personal daimon to the soul and emphasizes its divine origins, "god has given to each of us as his daimon this kind of soul, which we say lives in the top of our body" (αὐτὸ δαίμονα θεὸς ἐκάστῳ δέδωκεν, τοῦτο δὲ δὴ φαμεν οἰκεῖν μὲν ἡμῶν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ σώματι ..., *Ti.* 90a. 3–5)⁴³. Posidonius refers to "each person's daimon" as his guardian and protector and concludes, "the god is inside and is your own daimon"⁴⁴. Later Stoics say similar things⁴⁵. Of the Neo-Platonists, Plotinus in his treatise *On our allotted Daimon* mentions that the soul chooses each person's daimon and life in the other

³⁷ Bergman (1982) 30.

³⁸ Notice also the punning relationship between νέος and ναός (νεώς).

³⁹ See also XII. 100 and XXXVI. 170.

⁴⁰ Bergman (1982) 31–34.

⁴¹ Pritchard (1969) 6–7; for the cultic parallels see Betz (1996) 132, n. 84; for the Khepri theology see also *Eg. Pyr. T.* Utt. 587, par. 1587–90, Faulkner (1969) 238–41; *Eg. Coff. T.* Spell 307, Faulkner (2004) 226–27; and *Eg. Bk. Dd.* spells 85 and 153B, Faulkner (1972) 62–63 and 121–22.

⁴² Also in XXXVI. 217–19; see Bergman (1982) 34–36.

⁴³ In Plato's *Laws* there is also a reference to "each man's daimon" (τοῦ δαίμονος ἐκάστου), *Pl. Lg.* 5. 732c. 5–6; the idea is also found in the *Derweni Papyrus*: δαίμων γίνετα[ι ἐκάστῳ], *Derw. Pap. Col.* III. 4; Betegh (2004) 22–23; Kouremenos, Parassoglou, Tsantsanoglou (2006) 67.

⁴⁴ Posidon. *Fr.* 388 (Epict. 1. 14. 12–14).

⁴⁵ Epict. 2. 7. 3; 2. 16. 33; M. Aur. 2. 13, 2. 17, 3. 3. 2, 3. 4. 3, 3. 5. 1, 3. 6. 2, 3. 7, 3. 12, 3. 16. 2, 5. 10. 2, 5. 27, 7. 17, 8. 45, 12. 3, 12. 26; see Rutherford (1991) 215, n. 102.

world⁴⁶. This personal daimon, as Plotinus describes him, “is not entirely outside – but in the sense that he is not bound to us- and is not active in us, but is ours, to speak about the soul ...” (ὁ δαίμων οὗτος οὐ παντάπασιν ἔξω – ἀλλ’ οὕτως ὡς μὴ συνδε-
δεμένος – οὐδ’ ἐνεργῶν, ἡμέτερος δέ, ὡς ψυχῆς πέρι εἰπεῖν, *Enn.* III. 4. 5. 19–21)⁴⁷. Plotinus not only emphasizes the divine origins of the personal daimon, but also identifies him with god⁴⁸. Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* refers to the soul’s choice of each man’s life and to her own choice of the personal daimon (as her “leader”, ἡγεμόνα, and, as examined, “the fulfiller of the lives of the soul” *Myst.* IX. 6. 280. 8–9), who is allotted to us “not from one part of the heavenly realm, nor from any element of the visible ones, but from the whole cosmos and from every kind of life within it and every material substance, through which the soul descends into generation” (οὐκ ἄφ’ ἐνὸς μέρους τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὐδ’ ἀπὸ τινος στοιχείου τῶν ὁρωμένων ... ἄφ’ ὅλου δὲ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῆς παντοδαπῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ παντοδαποῦ σώματος, δι’ ὧν ἡ ψυχὴ κάτεισιν ἐπὶ τὴν γένεσιν”, *Myst.* IX. 6. 280. 2–5)⁴⁹. Similarly, Proclus in his *Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato* mentions “our allotted daimons” and discusses Socrates’ personal *daimonion*, identifying him with god⁵⁰. Thus, in Platonism, Stoicism and Neo-Platonism the personal daimon is associated to the soul as an internal entity with divine origins and described as the god inside the individual.

Why now does the magician need all these external divine entities, when the purpose of the spell as indicated in the title is the systasis with an internal entity, his personal daimon?

Although the magician does not make any explicit demands on the *genius loci*, the deities of Hour and Day, the abstract *encompassing* and Helios, there is an implicit but powerful logic in all this. That is: if the magician is to achieve proper *connection* with “his own daimon”, a *connection* must be made with the external “daimon of this place”. The antithesis between a particular external topographical dominance of the *genius loci* and the indefinite internal *space* of the personal daimon emphasises ritualistically the notion of space. This notion of space is enhanced by the notion of present time in the greetings of the deities of present Hour and Day. But the process goes further: to achieve proper *connection* with “his own daimon”, the magician must situate himself properly within the *encompassing* and must successfully invoke Helios, the great cosmic god. In this cosmic portrayal of Helios, Egyptian influences predominate. Iamblichus refers to the *coming together* (*connection*), σύνοδος, of

⁴⁶ Plot. *Enn.* III. 4. 5; see also Rist (1963).

⁴⁷ See also Pl. *Tim.* 90a. One could perhaps compare the modern psychological “self-help” notion of “getting in touch with your inner self”.

⁴⁸ Plot. *Enn.* III. 4. 6. 3–4 and III. 4. 6. 28–30.

⁴⁹ On the individual soul see Iambl. *Myst.* I. 8. 25. 6ff. Note also that the personal daimon directs men’s lives, “until we ever know how to establish a god as the guardian and leader of the (our) soul, through the hieratic theurgy” (ἕως ἂν διὰ τῆς ιερατικῆς θεουργίας θεὸν ἔφορον ἐπιστήσωμεν καὶ ἡγεμόνα τῆς ψυχῆς, Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 6. 280. 13–281. 4).

⁵⁰ Procl. in *Alc.* 78. 7, 78. 7–79. 16.

many entities “into the one living entity of the universe” and then to “friendship and love and strife” as the activities of the universe and the passions of the individuals⁵¹. This notion of love and strife is also found in Plotinus’ idealising definition of magic “and the true magic is the love and the strife again in the all” (καὶ ἡ ἀληθινὴ μαγεία ἡ ἐν τῷ παντὶ φιλία καὶ τὸ νεῖκος αὖ, *Enn.* IV. 4. 40. 6–7); and it is originated to the cosmic principles of the Pre-Socratic Empedocles⁵². Thus, the personal daimon, a concept which philosophers from the Pre-Socratics to Neo-Platonists had engaged with⁵³, is approached through the magico-theurgic ritual of systasis. According to that, a *connection* with the personal daimon is accomplished through a series of transitional ritualised processes from the external astrological entities of Place, Hour and Day, the abstract cosmic concept of the encompassing and the great cosmic god Helios to the internalised concept of the personal daimon. Hence, by controlling all these external astrological entities, the magician situates himself in the right astrological condition of getting hold of his personal daimon identified with his internal nature and synkrisis⁵⁴.

Therefore, the magico-theurgic ritual of σύστασις is based on the notion of the symbolic connection of two entities (the individual and the personal daimon), which is established gradually following a series of transitional astrologically correct *connections*, or *meetings* (e.g.: the individual and: (a) the *genius loci*, (b) the deities of Hour and Day, (c) the abstract *encompassing* and (d) Helios).

At the end of the spell (VII. 521–28) the ritual of two “male eggs”⁵⁵ follows to establish the connection between the individual and his personal daimon. According to that ritual, the magician is instructed to purify himself with one of these two eggs, licking off the name written on it, and to swallow the contents from the other⁵⁶. Since

⁵¹ Iambl. *Myst.* IV. 9. 192. 11–15: “Ἐτι δὲ ἡ τῶν πολλῶν σύνοδος εἰς ἓν τὸ τοῦ παντὸς ζῶον ... οἷον ἡ φιλία τοῦ παντὸς καὶ ὁ ἔρωσ καὶ τὸ νεῖκος, κατ’ ἐνέργειαν μὲν ὄντα ἐν τῷ παντί”.

⁵² On φιλία καὶ νεῖκος see also Emp. *Fr.* B17–K. 1–13, 19–20. Kirk–Raven–Schofield (1983) 287ff.; also Guthrie (1978) 152ff. On the “continuity of ideas and traditions” from 5th c. B. C. Greece to the magicians of the Roman Egypt see discussion on Kingsley (1995) 314–16.

⁵³ For the association between philosophy and ritual note also the theory according to which the Ionic philosophers of nature may have drawn on Cosmogonic myth and ritual; see Cornford (1952) 225ff.; Burkert (1996) 3; on theology of the early philosophers see Burnet (1930); Jaeger (1947); Vlastos (1952); on Ritual as cosmogony in theurgy see Shaw (1995) chpt. 14, 153–65; see also n. 52 above.

⁵⁴ Note also the astrological reference to “oikos” and “oikodespotes” of the zodiac in relation to the personal daimon; Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 2; 47 and nn. 5 and 6 above. On the ψυχῶν συστάσεις and the πληθυομένη σειρά in Proclus see *Hier. Techn.* 150. 1–5: “Οὕτω μεστὰ πάντα θεῶν, τὰ μὲν ἐν γῇ τῶν οὐρανίων, τὰ δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ πρόεισιν ἐκάστη πληθυομένη σειρά μέχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων· τὰ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πρὸ τῶν πάντων, ταῦτα ἐν πᾶσιν ἐξεφάνη, ἐν οἷς καὶ ψυχῶν συστάσεις ἄλλων ὑπ’ ἄλλοις ταπτομένων θεοῖς, ἔπειτα ζώων ἡλιακῶν εἰ τύχοι πλῆθος, οἷον λέοντες καὶ ἀλεκτρούνες, μετέχοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν τάξιν”.

⁵⁵ See Arist. *HA.* 4. 2, Pl. *NH.* 10. 74; also Betz (1996) 132.

⁵⁶ On licking and swallowing in Egyptian magic ritual see Ritner (1993) 92–110. On the magic ritual of ἐνπνευμάτωσις (“filling with spirit”) of the dead body, or of the statues of gods see Pachoumi (2011b) 736 and n. 25.

in this spell the magician's connection with his own daimon is set in a cosmic context, it may be relevant that in the Orphic cosmogonies that interested the Neo-Platonists and in the Egyptian cosmogony the egg has cosmic associations⁵⁷.

The whole atmosphere of the present spell is like that of the incident recorded by Porphyry in *Vita Plotini*, in which an Egyptian priest conjured up Plotinus' personal daimon (οἰκεῖος δαίμων) in the temple of Isis, the only pure place in Rome according to the Egyptian⁵⁸, and in which birds were strangled and held for protection by a friend present at the operation⁵⁹.

(b) Untitled spell for dream revelation (VII. 478–490). This spell contains an invocation, an offering, the preparation of a phylactery and the last and necessary stage for the revelation, the incubation. The invocation is addressed to Ἔρως, Ἐρωτύλλε (VII. 478). Martin translates Ἐρωτύλλε as “darling” from ἐρωτύλος⁶⁰. The use of the diminutive creates an affectionate, wheedling tone.

The magician's request of Eros is interesting: ἀπόστειλόν μοι τὸν ἴδιον τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ (VII. 478–79). A noun supplement after ἴδιον is needed. Preisendanz puts ἄγγελον, Betz puts δαίμονα⁶¹. Ἄγγελον looks natural after ἀπόστειλον, but τὸν ἴδιον ἄγγελον in relation to a human being would be odd, since it seems impossible after μοι to take ἴδιον in relation to Eros. Moreover, this spell precedes the spell Σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος, as analysed above, which was concerned to connect the magician to his “personal daimon”, so Betz's ἀπόστειλόν μοι τὸν ἴδιον δαίμονα is challenging but correct.

The spell involves a dream revelation. The personal daimon is to be sent (ἀπόστειλον μοι, “send to me”) by the god Eros and revealed in the magician's dreams. But, how is the relationship between the individual-magician and the personal daimon established in this spell?

The magician is instructed to take dirt from his sandal and use it in the burnt offerings to Eros (VII. 484). The reference to the sandal and dirt should further be discussed. First, the mention of sandal is a “sign”, or “symbol” associated with a deity in the Greek magical papyri. For example, in the “Writing-tablet to the waning Selene” (IV. 2241–2358) the sandal is the symbol of the goddess, which the magician keeps hidden (IV. 2292–93). Also, in the “Spell of Hecate Ereschigal against fear of punishment” (LXX. 4–25) the sandal is one of the magical signs of Ereschigal/Hecate (LXX. 10–11). In both these instances the possession of the sandal is connected with

⁵⁷ See also VII. 555–6, III. 145; *Orph. Fr.* 54, 55, 56; for the swallowing of an egg by the initiate to the Orphic cults see Mart. Cap. 2. 140; also Kirk-Raven-Schofield (1983) 22–29, 59–60; Morenz (1992) 177–79; for the Egyptian influences on the Orphic cosmic egg see also Kingsley (1994).

⁵⁸ Porph. *Plot.* 10. 19–22; see also Eitrem (1941) 62 ff., Dodds (1951) 289–90 and Betz (1981) 161–62.

⁵⁹ Porph. *Plot.* 10. 25–28.

⁶⁰ Betz (1996) 131, 334; see also Eitrem's note on “the Theocritean word Ἐρωτύλλε”; Eitrem (1923) 12. Elsewhere in the PGM there is a reference to Grotulos as a writer of Orphica, “Ἐρωτύλος ἐν τοῖς Ὀρφικοῖς” (XIII. 948).

⁶¹ Preisendanz (1974) 22; Betz (1981) 163.

ritualistic symbolisms of death and rebirth and most specifically with the magician's descent to the underworld⁶². In our spell, however, the sandal symbolism is reversed and the sandal becomes a symbol of the magician. Furthermore, the dirt from someone's own sandal, as Betz rightly points out, "is an instance of the magical substance representing the person's self"⁶³. The magician's burnt offering to Eros including dirt from his own sandal reveal his intention to equate himself with the divine using a symbol mostly applied to the divine and establish a relationship with his personal daimon through a dream revelation.

In the invocation, Eros is conjured "by the four regions of the universe" (κατὰ τῶν τεσσάρων κλιμάτων τοῦ κόσμου), followed by four magical names, and "by the one above the four regions of the universe", followed again by two magical names (VII. 481–83). The term κλίματα may refer to the seven latitudinal strips of the whole cosmos, or to the seven astrological zones⁶⁴. Porphyry in *De Antro Nympharum* associates it with the Chaldaeo-Persian magical beliefs of the Persian magicians, when mentioning that "the cosmic elements and regions" of cosmos created by Mithras were depicted in Zoroaster's cave in the Persian mountains⁶⁵. Thus, Eros' invocation adopts cosmic dimensions, since Eros is conjured by a superior force, the four regions of the universe. Consequently, the relationship of the magician with his personal daimon is upgraded to a cosmic level and established with the ritual of incubation, in which the personal daimon is internalised through a dream revelation.

(c) Untitled spell concerning your own shadow (III. 612–631). The concept of personal daimon is implicit in this spell. The magician is instructed that, if he makes specific offerings to the deity invoked, τεύξῃ] τῆς ἰδίας σκιᾶ[ς, ὥστε σοι αὐ[τῇ]ν ὑπη[ρετήσῃ]ν (III. 614–15). The text has been restored by Preisendanz. The verb [τεύξῃ] is Preisendanz's addition, which syntactically fits⁶⁶. Our spell (III. 612–631) follows the spell Σύστασις πρὸς Ἥλιον (III. 494–611), which is about the ritual of systasis with Helios. These two spells together with the third spell (III. 633–731) with the Coptic section that comes at the end may be parts, as Dillon rightly observes, of a broader "Systasis with Helios" spell (III. 494–731), since the "signs and symbols"

⁶² Kingsley (1995) chpt. 19; and on the underworld and Helios, *ibid.* chpt. 5; see also Betz (1980) 291; similarly in the *DTAud.* 242. 41 from Carthage Hekate is uniquely described with the composite epithet χρυσοσανδαλιαμοποτιχθονίαν (the golden-sandalled goddess of the lower world who drinks blood), which actually occurs only there (Audollent 1904); see also *S. M. I.* 49. 58–9; Daniel and Maltomini (1990) 192–204; see also *Eg. Pyr. T.* Ut356. par. 578; *Eg. Coff. T.* 37. 156.

⁶³ Betz (1981) 163. The same concept is found in *NT. Mar.* 6. 10–12, *Matt.* 10. 14–5, *Luk.* 9. 5–6, 10. 10–12, *Acts* 13. 51–2. The use of dirt in the magical operations could also be correlated to the reference to "the one who formed of dust (τὸν χοιπλάστην) the race of humans" (IV. 3046–47) describing the "light-bringing god" identified with the "god of Hebrews" Jesus and the Jewish Sabaoth in the exorcism spell IV. 3007–86.

⁶⁴ LSJ; it occurs elsewhere in the *PGM* (I. 12), but with a different meaning; on the four klimata and the seven astrological zones see Edmonds 2004, 277–81.

⁶⁵ *Porph. Ant.* 6. 15.

⁶⁶ Cf. LSJ B II 1 : τυγχάνω c. gen.: meet. On ἐντυχία and σύστασις see also n. 25 above.

(τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παράσημα) are mentioned in the first and second spell⁶⁷. In the third spell also there is a reference to the “symbols” (σύμβολα, 701). Furthermore, the ritual of systasis is mentioned both in the first (e.g. τὴν προσύ[τ]ασιν, 587–88) and the third spell (e.g.: αἰτῶν σύστασ[ιν τὴν] τοῦ θεοῦ, 695 and ὅταν οὖν συσταθῇς τῷ θεῷ, 698–699).

Betz and Dillon translate: “you will gain control of your own shadow, so that it will serve you”⁶⁸. This translation of τυγχάνω is slightly too definite. It is stated that: “it (your own shadow) will come to you (ἐλεύσεται σοι)” (III. 630). As in the two spells on the personal daimon discussed above (e.g.: VII. 505–528 and 478–490), the internal (personal daimon), or in the case of a shadow the immediately adjacent, is approached through the magico-theurgic ritual of systasis, which involves a series of external rituals⁶⁹. Therefore, according to the concept and practice of systasis, the verb τεύξῃ may better be translated “*you will meet* with your own shadow”, though there may also be a physical implication: “you will get hold of your own shadow”⁷⁰.

How could the *meeting* of the magician with his own shadow be interpreted? The shadow here seems to be understood as the soul⁷¹. This idea has a long history. In Homer’s *Odyssey*, Odysseus in his descent to the underworld sees the souls of the dead called “the images” (εἶδωλα). These images “flit about as shadows” (σκιαὶ αἰσσοῦσιν)⁷². Odysseus also in Hades wished to take the “soul of his dead mother” in his arms and three times sprang toward her, but three times she fluttered out of his hands “like a shadow or a dream”⁷³. In Egyptian religion also, especially of the later period, the soul called “Ba” was often associated with another part of a man, his shadow called “Khaibit”⁷⁴. We thus have an implicit equation of shadow and soul and personal daimon. The association between the personal daimon and the soul is found, as we have examined, in Platonism, Stoicism and Neo-Platonism⁷⁵.

The culmination of this spell is the revelation of the magician’s personal shadow. At the seventh hour, “it (the shadow) will come to you before (your) face (ἐλεύσεται

⁶⁷ E.g.: Part A, III. 494–611: ὅτι οἶδά σου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παρασ[η]μα (499–500) and εἴρηκά σου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παρασ[η]μα (536). Part B, III. 612–631: ὅτι οἶδά σου τὰ ἄγ[ια] δνόμ[α]τα καὶ τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ παρασ[η]μα (623–25) and εἴρηκά σου τὰ ἄγ[ια] δνόμ[α]τα καὶ τὰ [σημεῖα σου] καὶ τὰ παρασ[η]μα (627–28). Also the reference to “the spell above” (τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐπάνω, 626), as Preisendanz and Dillon notes. Preisendanz (1973) 59; Betz (1986) 34.

⁶⁸ Betz (1981) 163; Betz (1996) 34.

⁶⁹ E.g. “*connection* with your own daimon”, VII. 505–28; “*send* me my personal (daimon) this night” (VII. 478–79).

⁷⁰ See also nn. 71–72 below. Preisendanz also translates: “du wirst deines eigenen Schattens habhaft werden”; Preisendanz (1973) 59.

⁷¹ On “the soul as a man’s shadow and a reflection” see Frazer (1911) 77–100; for the connection of soul and shadow see Rohde (1925) chpt. 1 and Claus (1981) prt. 3.

⁷² Hom. *Od.* X. 495.

⁷³ Hom. *Od.* XI. 207.

⁷⁴ Budge (1996) 189–92.

⁷⁵ See 52–53 and nn. 43–50.

σοι ἔξαν[τ]ά [σο]υ”, “and you must address her saying, ‘follow me everywhere’ (ἀκολούθει μοι πανταχῇ)” (III. 630–32). Betz comments, “control of the self has been achieved when the magician’s shadow has become his assistant daimon (πάρεδρος δαίμων)”⁷⁶. But is this the case here? The πάρεδρος as an assistant is based on a different concept, according to which the divine assistance is originally external and first established by the magician following a series of rituals and invocations⁷⁷. However, there is the element of externality in the invocations of all these external entities, as we have examined⁷⁸. In our spell (III. 612–31) the personal shadow is connected with a person’s soul and identified with the personal daimon, which conceptualises an internal agent associated with a person’s destiny. The mystic allusions also of the phrase “it (the shadow) will come to you before (your) face”⁷⁹ support the magico-mystic identification of a person with his own shadow and so the internalisation of it. It also prevents us from assuming that the reference here is to a divine assistant. Consequently, the notion of πάρεδρος should not be confused with the concept of the personal daimon which refers to an originally internal agency identified with a person’s self.

After the equation of the personal shadow with the soul and the personal daimon has been justified, it is time to examine the question: How do the divine origins of the soul influence the initial equation between the personal daimon and the soul?

(d) The (mis-named)⁸⁰ “Binding erotic spell of Astrapsoukos” (VIII. 1–63).⁸¹ The spell consists of an invocation and the preparation of a ritual for which instructions are given at the end of the spell (VIII. 53–63). The invocation is addressed to Hermes described as “benefactor, [inventor] of drugs”⁸² and “benefactor of the world” and asked to be beneficent to the magician (VIII. 28 and 16).

We shall examine how the magician’s invocation to the god Hermes is gradually built up. The magician begins by invoking Hermes as follows: “come to me, lord Hermes, as fetuses come to the wombs of women” (ἐλ[θ]έ μοι, κύριε Ἑρμῆ, ὥς τὰ βρέφη εἰς τὰς κοιλίας τῶν γυναικῶν, VIII. 2–3). Here, we are dealing with the epiphany of a god and not of an internalised personal daimon as in the three spells

⁷⁶ Betz (1981) 164.

⁷⁷ See also Dodds (1951) 289–90, 304, n. 56. See also Pachoumi (2011a) 155–165.

⁷⁸ E.g. “connection with your own daimon”, VII. 505–28; “send me my personal (daimon) this night” (VII. 478–79); here also “you will meet with your own shadow so that it will serve you” (III. 614–15).

⁷⁹ For the allusion to mystic rituals cf. E. Ba. 469–70: κατ’ ὅμι’ and ὁρῶν ὁρῶντα. Generally for the magician and the deity see IV. 2332–33: ἡ θεωροῦσα καὶ θεωρουμένη βλέπω σε, καὶ βλέπεις με. In the extracts of Proclus’ commentary *On the Chaldaean Philosophy* it is stated: “Τὸ γὰρ ὄμμα, γνώσεως σύμβολον”, Procl. *Chald. Phil.* B. 8 (Pitra, 193).

⁸⁰ The magician is actually asking Hermes to give him “favour, sustenance, victory, prosperity, elegance, beauty of face and strength among all men and women” (I. 4–6).

⁸¹ Diogenes Laertius mentions the name of Astrampsychos among the names of the Persian magicians, D. L. *Pr.* 2; see also Fowden (1993) 26.

⁸² <εὐρετά> is Preisendanz’ certain supplement.

examined above. We have, however, referred to the description of the personal daemon as the god inside the individuals in Platonism, Stoicism and Neo-Platonism⁸³. Remarkably in this spell, god Hermes is internalised and compared with the conception of a baby in the womb⁸⁴. This simile seems in the first instance to draw on ideas from the Stoic physics or cosmology about the association of the fetus with *pneuma* and the soul⁸⁵. There are also allusions to the *Corpus Hermeticum*⁸⁶.

The notion of *divine possession* by pregnancy reflects an attempt of unification by installing the divine form in the human body. It also vividly stresses the intimacy of the desired *divine union* of the magician and the god. The idea of divine union/connection (systasis) with the god's form is also illustrated in the bowl divination spell (IV. 154–285), in which the magician refers to his union with Thyphon as, “I was connected/united with your holy form” (συνεστάθην σου τῇ ἱερᾷ μορφῇ, IV. 215–16) and later, “having taken possession of a nature equal to god nature” (ἰσοθέου φύσεως κυριεύσας) “by this connection” (διὰ ταύτης τῆς συστάσεως, IV. 220–21). A similar idea of union with the god in a mystic ritual context may also be implied in the disputed phrase of Euripides’ *Bacchae*: ὅταν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐς τὸ σῶμ’ ἔλθῃ πολὺς, λέγειν τὸ μέλλον τοὺς μεμηνότας ποιεῖ (“for when the god enters into the body mighty, he makes the maddened speak the future”, 300–1)⁸⁷. Similarly Iamblichus in *De Mysteriis* (III. 4–7) examining θεοφορία (divine possession) and divination asserts: “for neither the work of being possessed is human, nor does the whole (activity) base its power in human parts and actions; but these are otherwise subordinate, and the god uses them as instruments; the whole activity of divination is

⁸³ See 52–53 above.

⁸⁴ For the role of the womb in magic see Barb (1953); see also discussion on 61–62; for the role of fetuses in magic see Smith (2004); Frankfurter (2006).

⁸⁵ E.g.: Zeno Stoic. *Fr.* 128 (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* XV. 20, 1, Ar. *Did. Fr. phys.* 39 Diels, p. 470): τὸ δὲ σπέρμα φησὶν ὁ Ζήνων εἶναι, ὃ μεθήσιν ἄνθρωπος, πνεῦμα μεθ’ ὕγροῦ, ψυχῆς μέρος καὶ ἀπόσπασμα καὶ τοῦ σπέρματος τοῦ τῶν προγόνων κέραςμα καὶ μῆγμα τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μερῶν συνεληλυθὸς ἔχον γὰρ τοὺς λόγους τῷ ὅλῳ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῦτο, ὅταν ἀφεθῇ εἰς τὴν μήτραν, συλληφθὲν ὑπ’ ἄλλου πνεύματος, μέρους ψυχῆς τῆς τοῦ θήλεος, καὶ συμφυὲς γενόμενον κρυφθὲν τε φύει, κινούμενον καὶ ἀναρριπιζόμενον ὑπ’ ἐκείνου, προσλαμβάνον αἰεῖ [εἰς] τὸ ὕγρον καὶ αὐξόμενον ἐξ αὐτοῦ; Chrysipp. Stoic. *Fr.* 407 (Plu. *PrimFrig.* cp. 2 p. 946a): οἱ δὲ Στωϊκοὶ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα λέγουσιν ἐν τοῖς σώμασι τῶν βρεφῶν τῇ περιψύξει στομοῦσθαι καὶ μεταβάλλον ἐκ φύσεως γίνεσθαι ψυχὴν; Posidon. *Fr.* 401. 33ff.: τὸ δὲ σπέρμα εἶναι σταγόνα ἐγκεφάλου περιέχουσαν ἐν ἑαυτῇ θερμὸν ἀτμόν· ταύτην δὲ προσφερομένην τῇ μήτρᾳ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου ἰχῶρα καὶ ὕγρον καὶ εἶμα προέεσθαι, ἐξ ὧν σάρκα τε καὶ νεῦρα καὶ ὀστέα καὶ τρίχας καὶ τὸ ὅλον συνίστασθαι σώμα ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀτμοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ αἴσθησιν.

⁸⁶ E.g.: *Corp. Herm. Except XV* “From the teachings of Hermes to Ammon” (2–7). On Stoic elements see Scott (1936) 441–446, esp. 442.

⁸⁷ For Plutarch “the god” here is used metonymically for the wine: ὥς οἶνος ἀναθυμαθεὶς ἕτερα πολλὰ κινήματα καὶ λόγους ἀποκειμένους καὶ λανθάνοντας ἀποκαλύπτει· τὸ γὰρ βακχεύσιμον καὶ μανιώδες μαντικὴν πολλὴν ἔχει· κατ’ Εὐριπίδην (Plu. *Def. Orac.* 40. 432E); also in *Anth. Pal.* 7. 105. 3: Διόνυσος ὅτ’ ἄν πολὺς ἐς δέμας ἔλθῃ. I agree here with Dodds’ comment: “I do not think that l. 300 means merely ‘when a man has drunk a great deal of wine’ though Plutarch perhaps understood it so”, and I would further add that the phrase also alludes to the idea of divine possession or mystic union of the prophet with the god, in order to deliver a prophecy; Dodds (1960) 109; also Seaford (1997) 177.

accomplished by him (the god), and he acts by himself without being mixed, detached from the others, without the soul or anything or the body being moved”⁸⁸. In our spell although the magico-theurgic term *systasis* does not appear, we do have the notion of divine union of the magician with the god described in mystic contexts.

But how is this theurgic or divine/mystic union established? Before I analyse the spell, I shall refer to the distinction of the notion of divine union achieved by the theurgists and the theoretical philosophers. For Plotinus the divine union with the god in philosophy is accomplished by the contemplation of god and beauty⁸⁹. Iamblichus in *De Mysteriorum* states: “for nor the contemplation unites theurgists to the gods” (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ ἔννοια συνάπτει τοῖς θεοῖς τοὺς θεουργοὺς), and asks: “for what then would hinder the theoretical philosophers from establishing the theurgic union with the gods?” (ἐπεὶ τί ἐκώλυε τοὺς θεωρητικῶς φιλοσοφοῦντας ἔχειν τὴν θεουργικὴν ἔνωσιν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς;). The answer according to Iamblichus is: “the accomplishment of acts not to be spoken and which are executed divinely beyond all conception and the power of unspeakable symbols conceived only by the gods establish the theurgic union” (ἡ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἀρρήτων καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν νόησιν θεοπρεπῶς ἐνεργουμένων τελεσιουργία ἢ τε τῶν νοουμένων τοῖς θεοῖς μόνον συμβόλων ἀφθέγκτων δύναμις ἐντίθησι τὴν θεουργικὴν ἔνωσιν, *Myst.* II. 11. 96. 13–97. 2)⁹⁰.

In our spell the theurgic or divine/mystic union is justified by the magician’s knowledge of the god, his signs and symbols, which is emphasised throughout the invocation. The knowledge of the signs and symbols of the god adjured is a common characteristic of the invocation spells to the personal daimon, as already examined in III. 612–31 and VII. 478–90⁹¹. Moreover, the magician defines himself as one who knows “the names for you (Hermes) in heaven”; also “I know and your forms (οἶδά σου καὶ τὰς μορφάς)”, “I know (οἶδά σου) and your wood” and “I know (οἶδά σου) and your barbarian names” (VIII. 6–15 and 20–1). Iamblichus, as examined above, claims that the theurgic union is achieved by “the accomplishment of acts not to be spoken” and by the power “of unspeakable symbols”⁹².

⁸⁸ Iambl. *Myst.* III. 7. 115. 2–8: “οὔτε γὰρ ἀνθρώπινόν ἐστι τὸ τῆς θεοφορίας ἔργον, οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνους μορίους ἢ ἐνεργήμασι τὸ πᾶν ἔχει κῦρος· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἄλλως ὑπόκειται, καὶ χρῆται αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς ὀργάνοις· τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἔργον τῆς μαντείας δ’ αὐτοῦ πληροῖ, καὶ ἀμυγῶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀφεϊμένος οὔτε ψυχῆς κινουμένης οὐδ’ ὅτιον οὔτε σώματος ἐνεργεῖ καθ’ αὐτόν. Ὅθεν δὴ καὶ ἀψευδῶς γίνονται τὰ μαντεία τὰ οὕτως ὡς λέγω κατορθούμενα”.

⁸⁹ Plot. *Enn.* I. 6. 9. 33–35: Γενέσθω δὴ πρῶτον θεοειδὴς πᾶς καὶ καλὸς πᾶς, εἰ μέλλει θεάσασθαι θεόν τε καὶ καλόν; also Plot. *Enn.* VI. 7. 34.

⁹⁰ Also Iambl. *Myst.* IX. 1, 5, 9. Dodds also argues for the distinction between the Plotinian *mystical union* and the union with the divine in magic and theurgy; Dodds (1951) 286, 302; see also Dodds (1928) 141 ff., and Peterson (1933) 30 ff. On the symbols in theurgy see also Procl. *Crat.* 71. 64–82. On the symbols and the *systasis* of the soul see Procl. *Chald. Phil.* E. 21–2 (Pitra, 195): “συνέστηκε γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν θεῶν συμβόλων”.

⁹¹ See VII. 478–79 and III. 624–27, 629–30.

⁹² Iambl. *Myst.* II. 11. 96. 13–97.2; see above and n. 90.

After mentioning the god's names and signs, the magician refers personally to Hermes saying: "I know you (οἶδά σε), Hermes, who you are and where you come from and which your city is; Hermoupolis" and "come to me (ἐλ[θ]έ μοι), lord Hermes, many-named⁹³, who knows (εἰδώς) the things hidden beneath heaven and earth" (VIII. 13–15)⁹⁴. Another striking thing in the spell is the parallel the magician draws between his appeal to Hermes and similar appeals made to Hermes by the Egyptian goddess Isis in times of crisis. This parallelism enhances the status of the magician, comparing his invocation with that of Isis, "the greatest of all the gods". The magician may also possibly exploit a pseudo-etymological link in Greek between ἵσις and knowledge from the stem ἵσ- of the verb οἶδα, which is constantly repeated in the spell⁹⁵. This steadily increasing status of the magician on the divine scale helps to build a climax in the divine *mystic* union with the god⁹⁶.

The womb analogy now acquires another implication in relation to knowledge. In the spell Σύστασις πρὸς Ἥλιον (III. 494–611), the magician stresses his own knowledge of Helios and associates Helios with knowledge, and more precisely with the womb of knowledge, as stated at the end of the invocation: "We understood, O womb of all Knowledge, we understood, O womb pregnant through the father's begetting, we understood, O eternal permanence of the pregnant father" (ἐγνωρίσαμεν, μήτρα πάσης γνώσεως, ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ὃ μήτρα κηφόρε ἐν πατρός φυτεία, ἐγνωρίσαμεν, ὃ πατρός κηφοροῦντος αἰώνιος διαμονή, III. 603–6)⁹⁷. In the *Chaldaean Oracles* also the wombs are associated with the world-forming ideas⁹⁸. Similarly, in the "Interpretation of Knowledge (XI. I)" of the *Nag Hammadi* Library there is an association of Knowledge with the Womb: "[And she caused] him to know [that] she is [the] Womb" (3)⁹⁹. Of course, it is a paradoxical metaphor, but the idea of the "pregnant father" is explicit in the Σύστασις πρὸς Ἥλιον (III. 494–611) spell, and religious myth and thought generally provide parallels for pregnant fathers with wombs. For example, in Euripides' *Bacchae* Zeus says in the choral song: "Go,

⁹³ On "many-named" (πολύωνυμος) see Pachoumi (2011a) 161 and (2011c) 174–75.

⁹⁴ The reference is actually to Hermes-Thoth. Hermes in Greek religion is the interpreter of the divine associated with the founding of civilisation (Burkert 1996, 157–59). The Egyptian god Thoth is similarly associated with sacred writings, wisdom and knowledge of magic and medicine (Morenz 1992, 270); Wiedemann (2003) 225 ff.). Due to their common characteristics, Hermes and Thoth were systematically identified with each other in the Hellenistic and Roman period (Dunand and Zivie-Coche 2002, 140–7).

⁹⁵ Although the name Isis actually derived from the throne that the goddess personified (Morenz 1992, 23), a pseudo-etymological link maybe created in Greek between ἵσις and οἶδα.

⁹⁶ See also Betz (1981) 165.

⁹⁷ Here the γνω-words themselves presumably convey sexual imagery (cf.: Men. fr. 558. 4–5, "ἔπειτα φοιτῶν καὶ κολακεύων ἐμέ τε καὶ τὴν μητέρ' ἔγνω μ'"; Heraclid. Pol. 64; LXX Ge. 4. 1, "Ἀδάμ δὲ ἔγνω Εὐάν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκε τὸν Κάϊν"; NT, Luke 1. 34, "πὺς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω"; NT, Matt. 1. 25, "καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν"); Plu. Galb. 9, "ἐγνώκει γὰρ ὁ Γάιος, ὡς ἔοικε, τὴν τεκοῦσαν αὐτὸν ἔτι μειράκιον ὧν οὐκ ἀειδῇ τὴν ὕψιν οὖσαν, ἐκ δ' ἀκεστρίας ἐπιμυσθίου Καλλίστῳ, Καίσαρος ἀπελευθέρῳ, γεγεννημένην".

⁹⁸ Procl. Crat. 58, 16; see also Lewy (1978) 120–22.

⁹⁹ Transl. by Turner in Robinson (ed.) (1996) 474.

Dithyrambos, enter my male womb” (Ἴθι, Διθύραμβ’, ἐμὸν ἄρσενά τάνδε βᾶθι νηδύν, 526–7), in regard to the myth of the double birth of Dionysus¹⁰⁰. A similar cosmogony about Zeus is presented in the *Derveni Papyrus*¹⁰¹. And in the *Letter of Jacob* in the *New Testament* it is stated that God (the father) “gave birth to us” (ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς, 1. 18. 1).

The magician’s knowledge of the god, which is an important factor in this theurgic or divine/mystic union, reaches the level of identification at the end of the invocation, when the magician says: “for you are I and I am you, your name is mine and mine is yours” (σὺ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ σύ, τὸ σὸν ὄνομα ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν σόν, VIII. 36–37), and then again: “I know you, Hermes, and you me. I am you and you are I” (οἶδα σε, Ἑρμοῦ, καὶ σὺ ἐμέ. ἐγὼ εἰμι σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγὼ, VIII. 49–50). Similarly, in XIII. 734–1077 the magician invokes the god: “you may enter my *nous* and my *phrenes* for all the time of my life and you may accomplish for me all the wishes of my soul” (εἰσελθοῖς τὸν ἐμὸν νοῦν καὶ τὰς ἐμὰς φρένας εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς μου καὶ ποιήσῃς μοι πάντα τὰ θελήματα τῆς ψυχῆς μου, XIII. 791–94), because, as he asserts, “for you are I and I am you” (σὺ γὰρ εἰ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ σύ, XIII. 795). In our spell also, it is the “reciprocal” knowledge of man and god that enables him to cross the boundaries and achieve the mystic union. Furthermore, the divine/mystic union of the magician and the god is described as an almost erotic union, the final logic of the opening simile.

Similarly in the *Corpus Hermeticum* V, “A discourse of Hermes to his son Tat”, Hermes claims about god: “for you are whatsoever I am, you are whatsoever I do, you are whatsoever I say” (σὺ γὰρ εἰ ὁ [ε]ἶμι ὧ, σὺ εἰ ὁ ἄν ποιῶ, σὺ εἰ ὁ ἄν λέγω, 11). In the Gnostic “Gospel of Thomas (II. 2)” of the *Nag Hammadi* Library, Jesus also identifies himself with the initiated, saying: “He who will drink from my mouth will become like me. I myself shall become he, and the things that are hidden will be revealed to him” (108)¹⁰².

A similar identification between Mani and his *syzygos*, *conjunct fellow* or *twin companion*, is expressed in the *Cologne Mani Codex*, when Mani says: “I recognized him and I understood that I am he, whom I was separated from. I testified that I myself am he and that I am unshaken” (ἐπέγνων μὲν αὐτὸν καὶ συνῆκα ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐξ οὗ διεκρίθην. ἐπεμαρτύρησα δὲ ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐκεῖνος αὐτός εἰμι ἀκλό[γητο]ς ὑπάρχων ..., CMC 24. 11–16)¹⁰³. The pronoun ἐκεῖνος refers to σύζυγος, “the twin companion, the personification of a typically Gnostic concept, the transcendent projection of one’s soul”, as defined by Henrichs¹⁰⁴. He notion of σύζυγος is present

¹⁰⁰ E. Ba. 87–102.

¹⁰¹ Kouremenos, Parassoglou, Tsantsanoglou (2006) Col. XIII; on Zeus swallowing the phallus likened to the sun see Janko (2002) 26–27; Betegh (2004) 29; Burkert (2004) 90.

¹⁰² Translated from the Coptic by Lambdin in Robinson (ed.) (1996) 137.

¹⁰³ Henrichs and Koenen (1975) 27 and 80, n. 59.

¹⁰⁴ Henrichs (1979) 340.

throughout the text (e.g. *CMC* 22. 16–18: καὶ ὅστις [ἐκεῖνός, ἐστι]γ αὐτὸς σύζυγός μου ἄγρυπνος ὢν ... and 23. 6–7: καὶ ὁ σύζυγός μου ὁ ἀραρώς τίς ποτ' ἐστίν)¹⁰⁵.

The repeated stress on the reciprocal knowledge of the individual and the god has in itself mystical associations. It is paralleled, for example, in Euripides' *Bacchae*, when Dionysus says to Pentheus: “you don't know what your life is, nor what you are doing nor who you are” (οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῆς, οὐδ' ὁ δοῖς, οὐδ' ὅστις εἶ, 506), or to Cadmus at the end of the tragedy: “you understood us too late. When you should have, you did not know” (ὅψ' ἐμάθεθ' ἡμᾶς, ὅτε δὲ χρῆν, οὐκ ἤδετε), and Cadmus in his turn admits: “we have understood these things” (ἐγνώκαμεν ταῦτ', 1345–6)¹⁰⁶.

The theurgic or divine/mystic union and identification between the magician and the god, is further justified: “for you are I and I am you, your name is mine and mine is yours; for I am your image (ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι τὸ εἶδωλόν σου)” (VIII. 36–38). How is this to be understood? The term εἶδωλον is often identified with the soul in Greek thought and philosophy. We have already referred, for example, to the Homeric “images” (εἶδωλα) of the underworld as the souls of dead men, when we examined the equation of the soul with the personal shadow and the personal daimon¹⁰⁷. Diogenes Laertius in his first book of the *Lives of the Philosophers* referring to the Chaldaeans and magicians reports that according to Sotion they practice both divination and prediction saying that “the gods appear to them and that the air is full of *eidola* which enter into the eyes of the sharp-sighted, flowing off by exhalations”¹⁰⁸. In Neo-Platonism, the concept of “image” after death is mentioned in the *Chaldaean Oracles*, when referring to the afterlife of the initiated: “You will not leave behind the dung of matter for the river edge, but (there is) a portion for the image (εἰδῶλω μερίς) in an all-visible place”¹⁰⁹. Proclus in *The Elements of Theology* argues that all the divine souls are “gods on the psychic level” (θεοὶ ψυχικῶς), and defined the soul as “the perceptible things by means of examples” (παραδειγματικῶς μὲν τὰ αἰσθητά),

¹⁰⁵ Also *CMC* 13. 2: ἄλλοτε δὲ ὡς σύζυγος φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀέρος διελέγετο πρὸς ἐμὲ λέγουσα; 18. 11–18: ὁ μακαριώτατος κύριος ἐσπ[α]γ[η]νίσθη ἐπ' ἐμὲ καὶ με ἐκ[ά]λεσεν εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ χάριν καὶ ἀπέστειλén μοι [ἐκεῖθεν ἐ]ϋθὺς σύζυγόν [μου τὸν ἐν δόξῃ μ]εγάλῃ φαινόμενον ...; 19. 15–19: (ὁ πατήρ μου) ποιήσας ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν φειδῶ διὰ τῶν πλείστων αὐτοῦ φ[α]νερῶσεων] ἀπ[έ]στειλέ[ν] μοι τὸν σύζυγόν [μου ...; 32.7–10: αὐτόθι ἀνέσχεν καταντ[ι]κρὺ ἐμοῦ στὰς ὁ ἐν[δοξότατ]ός μου σύζυγος λέγων πρὸς ἐμέ; and 69. 14–21: (ὁ ἐμός πατήρ) ἐξαπέστειλεν ἐκεῖθεν σύζυγόν μου τὸν ἀσφαλέστατον, τὸ[ν] πάντα ἀθανασίας καρπ[ι]όν, ὡς ἂν οὗτος ἐξαγοράσῃ[ι] με καὶ λυτρώσαιτο [ἐκ] τῆς πλάνης τῶν τοῦ [νό]μου ἐκείνου; Henrichs and Koenen (1975) 1–85; also Henrichs and Koenen (1970) 161–216.

¹⁰⁶ On knowledge see also the “Gospel of Thomas (II. 2)” of the *Nag Hammadi Library*: “You read the face of the sky and of the earth, but you have not recognized the one who is before you, and you do not know how to read this moment” (91); transl. by Lambdin in Robinson (ed.) (1996) 136.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. 57–58 above.

¹⁰⁸ D. L. I. 7. 3–6, “ἀσκεῖν τε μαντικὴν καὶ πρόρρησιν, καὶ θεοὺς αὐτοῖς ἐμφανίζεσθαι λέγοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδῶλων πλήρη εἶναι τὸν ἀέρα, κατ' ἀπόρροϊαν ὑπ' ἀναθυμιάσεως εἰσκρινομένων ταῖς ὕψει τῶν ὀξυδερκῶν”.

¹⁰⁹ *Chald. Or.* 158, “Οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς ὕλης σκύβαλον κρημνῷ καταλείψεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδῶλω μερίς εἰς τόπον ἀμφιφάνοντα”; Lewy (1978) 213–4; see also G. Gem. Pleth. 15a; Tambrun-Krasker and Tardieu (1995) 12.

and “the intelligible things by means of images (εἰκονικῶς δὲ τὰ νοητά)”¹¹⁰. Proclus, here, according to his doctrine on the intelligence (nous/νοῦς) becomes more analytical in the definition of the soul, associating the images with the intelligible things.

These general associations between image (εἶδωλον) and soul are relevant to our spell. But we must also take account of more specific ideas. In the Jewish *Old Testament* man is created in the image of God (*Genesis* 1. 24). The idea of a man created by god in “the image of the creator’s thought” (εἶδωλον ... τοῦ νοήματος τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, 3) is also expressed in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, *Excerpt VIII*, “A discourse of Hermes to his son”.¹¹¹ Similarly in the *Corp. Herm.* V, “A discourse of Hermes to his son Tat”, Hermes advises Tat: “think, my son, how man is created in the womb” (νόησον, ὃ τέκνον, δημιουργούμενον ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον) and learn who is the one who created “this fair and godlike image of man” (τὴν καλὴν ταύτην καὶ θεῖαν [τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] εἰκόνα, 6). The converse idea of god as the mirror image of the worshipper occurs in the *Acta Joannis*, as Betz points out, when Christ states among other things: “I am a mirror (ἔσοπτρον) to you who know me”¹¹². Christ and the initiated are the mirror image of each other. This mirror image derives from the Dionysiac mysteries, as Plotinus makes clear when he refers to the “souls of men” who see their “images” (εἶδωλα) “as if in the mirror of Dionysus” (οἷον Διονύσου ἐν κατόπτρῳ)¹¹³.

Also relevant is another passage in the Greek magical papyri, “The Prayer of Deliverance” (I. 195–222), where the magician states concerning Christ that God “said that you have strength, in accordance with his *likeness* (καθ’ ὁμοιότητα αὐτοῦ), as much strength as he has” (I. 211–2). Here the concept of “likeness” justifies the relationship between Christ and his Father. From the *New Testament*, a good parallel can be found in Paul’s *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, in which Christ is presented as the likeness (εἰκὼν) of God (2. 4. 4).

Of all these, Plotinus is the best single parallel. It seems plausible that the magician’s conception of himself as the εἶδωλον of Hermes reflects the influence of Dionysiac mystical ideas. But it is also worth noting that the use of the term εἶδωλον as the final mystical justification for the identification of the human and the divine is etymologically pointed, reinforcing the essential logical connection between “knowledge” (οἶδα, etc.) and “likeness” (εἶδωλον) and identification and mystical union.

Thus, the theurgic or divine/mystic union in the last spell is attained, as examined, through a series of invocations and rituals. It is characterised by the desirable *reciprocal* knowledge of man and god and by the process of identification. The use of

¹¹⁰ Procl. *Inst.* 185 and 195; see Dodds (1933) 163 and 171.

¹¹¹ See also *Corp. Herm. Excerpt.* XV (and n. 84 above); see also Betz (1981) 166–67.

¹¹² *Act. Joan.* 95. 16f.; see Betz (1981) 167.

¹¹³ Plot. *Enn.* IV. 3. 12; cf. Nonn. *D.* 6. 169–206; *Orph. Fr.* 209; Vernant (1990) 468ff.; on the double vision of Pentheus in E. *Ba.* 918–22 see Seaford (1987); note also the parallelism of Dido’s psychological situation before her death (her suicide) with Pentheus’ vision of a double sun and double Thebes in Virgil (*Aen.* IV. 470).

εἴδωλον defines this union between the magician and the god in a mystical context as two entities of the self-identified/unified one, the εἴδωλον.

Conclusions

In the first of our spells, the so-called “Connection with your own daimon” (VII. 505–28), the conceptualisation of the personal daimon is comparable to philosophical approaches of Platonism and Neo-Platonism and perhaps also of Stoicism. The relationship of the personal daimon with Tyche, Destiny and other abstract concepts reflects such philosophical influences. The process, however, followed for the connection with the personal daimon is specified by the magico-theurgic ritual of systasis, which offers a pragmatic approach of magical ritual as opposed to the theoretical approach of philosophy. The systasis with the personal daimon is established through a series of transitional ritualistic processes from external lesser deities, abstract cosmic concepts and Helios to the internalised concept of the personal daimon. The systasis is finally accomplished on a cosmic level with influences from Egyptian religion and Orphic cosmogony, as indicated in the greetings to Helios and the reference to the ritual of the two male eggs.

In the second untitled spell (VII. 478–90), the relationship with the personal daimon is internalised through a dream revelation. This relationship is established in a cosmic level with the god Eros being conjured by the four regions of the universe. That Neo-Platonic reference reveals influences from Chaldaeo-Persian magical beliefs.

In the third spell, the untitled spell for meeting your own shadow (III. 612–31), as in the two above spells, the internal, or in the case of a shadow the immediately adjacent, is approached through ritualistic processes. The shadow here is associated with the soul and we have an implicit equation of shadow and soul and personal daimon. There are similarities to Platonist, Stoic and Neo-Platonist thinking about the relationship between the soul and the personal daimon, though there are also parallels with much earlier religious ideas reflected in Homer in the association of a person’s soul with his shadow. There are also mystical allusions in the description of the meeting with the shadow which support the notion of the identification of a person with his own shadow in a magico-mystical context.

In the last spell examined, the “Binding love spell of Astrapsoukos” (VIII. 1–63), the epiphany of the god Hermes is internalised and compared with the conception of a baby in the womb. There are affinities to *Corpus Hermeticum*, Stoic physiology and Neo-Platonism and influences from mystery religions. The association of Knowledge and the Womb alludes to the *Chaldaean Oracles* and the Gnostic *Nag Hammadi Library*. The magician’s personal knowledge of the divine is comparable to the knowledge of the initiate in the mystery cults and plays an essential role in the magico-theurgic union between the magician and his internalised god Hermes. The identification of the magician with Hermes can also be paralleled with similar identi-

fications from the *Corpus Hermeticum*, the *Nag Hammadi* Library and the *Cologne Mani Codex*.

Finally, the spells of the Greek magical papyri examined in this paper reflect a tension towards ritualising religio-philosophical concepts, such as the concept of the personal daimon, or even abstract notions associated with it, like Tyche, Time, Hour, the encompassing or the *eidolon*; but, more precisely, they reveal a tension toward ritualising the connection (*systasis*) between the individual and his personal daimon. The connection is accomplished in the spells through a series of ritualistic processes. But that should not prevent the existence of the opposite process, namely that Neoplatonic philosophy reflects a tension towards philosophising ritual texts. Nevertheless, at any case it is evident that both magic ritual and philosophical theory draw on the same source of theological and cosmological concepts. The personal daimon in all our four spells is presented as an internal entity associated with the personal shadow and soul, or even with a god who is identified with the magician as the initiated with the divine in the mystery cults¹¹⁴.

Bibliography

- E. Abel, *Orphica*, Leipzig 1885.
 J. Allen, *Inference from Signs. Ancient Debates about the Nature of Evidence*, Oxford 2001.
 K. Alt, *Der Daimon als Seelenführer. Zur Vorstellung des persönlichen Schutzgeistes bei den Griechen*, *Hyperboreus* 6, 2000, 219–252.
 A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae*, Paris 1904.
 A. A. Barb, *Diva Matrix*, *JWCI* 16, 1953, 193–238.
 J. Bergman, *An Ancient Egyptian Theogony in a Greek Magical Papyrus*, in: *Studies in Egyptian Religion* (Numen Supplements 43), Leiden 1982, 28–37.
 G. Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus*, Cambridge 2004.
 H. D. Betz, *Fragments of a Catabasis Ritual in a Greek Magical Papyrus*, *HR* 19, 1980, 287–295.
 H. D. Betz, *The Delphic Maxim ‘Know Yourself’ in the Greek Magical Papyri*, *HR* 21, 1981, 156–171.
 H. D. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, Chicago 1986.
 H. D. Betz, *The Mithras Liturgy. Text, Translation and Commentary*, Tübingen 2003.
 M. Boyce, *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*, Chicago 1984.
 J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton 1983.
 E. A. W. Budge, *Egyptian Religion. Ideas of the Afterlife in Ancient Egypt*, New York 1996.
 W. Burkert, *Air-Imprints or Eidola. Democritus’ Aetiology of Vision*, *ICS* 2, 1977, 97–109.
 W. Burkert, *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*, Transl. by J. Raffan, Oxford 1996.
 W. Burkert, *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis. Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*, Cambridge, Mass. – London 2004.
 J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, London 1930.
 F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh 1972.
 H. Chadwick, *Origen, Contra Celsum*, Cambridge 1953.

¹¹⁴ I would like to thank Professor John Dillon and the anonymous reviewers of *Philologus* for their helpful comments and for looking at the final version. I am also Grateful to Yannis Tzifopoulos. I would like to dedicate this paper to my father George.

- L. J. Cirao, Supernatural Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri, in: M. Meyer and P. Mirecki (eds.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Leiden 1995, 279–295.
- E. C. Clarke, J. M. Dillon and J. P. Hershbell, *Iamblichus, De Mysteriis*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes, Leiden 2003.
- D. B. Claus, *Toward the Soul. An Inquiry into the Meaning of Psyche before Plato*, New Haven 1981.
- F. M. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought from Homer to the Age of Alexander*, London – Toronto 1923.
- F. M. Cornford, *Principium Sapientiae. The Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought*, Cambridge 1952.
- R. W. Daniel and F. Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum*, Vol. I. (*Papyrologica Coloniensia* 16. 1), Opladen 1990.
- P. Destrée and N. D. Smith (eds.), *Socrates' Divine Sign. Religion, Practice and Value in Socratic Philosophy* (*Apeiron* 38. 2), Kelowna, BC 2005.
- M. W. Dickie, *Magic and the Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*, London – New York 2001.
- J. Dillon, *Iamblichi Chalcidensis in Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta*, Leiden 1973.
- J. Dillon, *Image, Symbol and Analogy. Three Basic Concepts of Neoplatonic Allegorical Exegesis*, in: R. B. Harris (ed.), *The Significance of Neoplatonism*, Norfolk 1976.
- E. R. Dodds, *The Parmenides of Plato and the Origin of the Neoplatonic One*, CQ 22, 1928, 129–142.
- E. R. Dodds, *Proclus, The Elements of Theology*, Oxford 1933.
- E. R. Dodds, *Theurgy and Its Relationship to Neoplatonism*, JRS 37, 1947, 55–69.
- E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1951.
- E. R. Dodds, *Tradition and Personal Achievement in the Philosophy of Plotinus*, JRS 49, 1959, 1–7.
- E. R. Dodds, *Euripides, Bacchae*, Oxford 1960.
- F. Dunand and C. Zivie-Coche, *Gods and Men in Egypt. 3000 BCE to 395 CE*, Ithaca – London 2004.
- R. Edmonds, *Faces of the Moon. Cosmology, Genesis and the Mithras Liturgy*, in: R. S. Boustian and A. Y. Reed (eds.), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, Cambridge 2004.
- S. Eitrem, *The Greek Magical Papyri in the British Museum*, Kristiania 1923.
- S. Eitrem, *Die σύστασις und der Lichtzauber in der Magie*, SO 8, 1929, 49–53.
- S. Eitrem, *La Théurgie chez les Neoplatoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques*, SO 21, 1941, 49–79.
- S. Eitrem, *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*, Oslo 1950.
- R. O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Oxford 1969.
- R. O. Faulkner, *The Book of the Dead*, vol. I, New York 1972.
- R. O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*, Oxford 2004.
- G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes. A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*, Princeton 1993.
- D. Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt. Assimilation and Resistance*, Princeton 1998.
- D. Frankfurter, *Fetus Magic and Sorcery Fears*, GRBS 46, 2006, 37–62.
- L. P. Gerson, *God and Greek Philosophy*, London – New York 1990.
- J. G. Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, Cardiff 1970.
- W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Vol. II: *The Presocratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*, Cambridge 1978.
- D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, *Before Sexuality. The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton 1990.
- A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, *Ein Griechischer Mani-Codex*, ZPE 5, 1970, 161–216.
- A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex* (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780). *Περὶ τῆς γέννης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*. Edition der Seiten 1–72, ZPE 19, 1975, 1–85.
- A. Henrichs, *The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered*, HSCP 83, 1979, 339–367.
- A. Henrichs, *He Has a God in Him. Human and Divine in the Modern Perceptions of Dionysos*, in: C. Farone and T. H. Carpenter (eds.), *Masks of Dionysos*, Ithaca 1993.
- R. D. Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean*, London 1910.
- E. Hornung, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt. The One and the Many* (Engl. Transl. by J. Baines), London – Melbourne – Henley 1983.
- W. W. Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, Oxford 1947.
- R. Janko, *The Derveni Papyrus. An Interim Text*, ZPE 141, 2002, 1–62.

- S. I. Johnston, *Rising to the Occasion. Theurgical Ascent in its Cultural Milieu*, in: P. Schäfer and H. Kippenberg (eds.), *Envisioning Magic*, Leiden 1997, 165–194.
- D. R. Jordan, P. Duk. inv. 729, *Magical Formulae*, GRBS 46, 2006, 159–173.
- R. Kasser, M. Meyer and G. Wurst, *The Gospel of Judas from Codex Tchacos*, Washington 2006.
- P. Kingsley, *From Pythagoras to Turba philosophorum. Egypt and Pythagorean Tradition*, JWCi 57, 1994, 1–13.
- P. Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery and Magic. Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*, Oxford 1995.
- G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers. A History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge 1983.
- R. Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets. The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper and Bronze Lamellae, Part I: Published Texts of Known Provenance (Papyrologica Coloniensia Vol. 22. 1)*, Opladen 1994.
- T. Kouremenos, G. M. Parassoglou and K. Tsantsanoglou, *The Derveni Papyrus (Studi e testi per il corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini 13)*, Firenze 2006.
- H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Mysticism, Magic and Platonism in the Later Roman Empire*, Paris 1978.
- A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy. Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, London – Bath 1986.
- A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers, Vol. I: Translations of the Principal Sources with Philosophical Commentary*, Cambridge 1997.
- L. Manniche, *Sexual Life in Ancient Egypt*, London 1997.
- D. McGibbon, *The Religious Thought of Democritus*, Hermes 93, 1965, 385–397.
- Ph. Merlan, *Plotinus and Magic*, Isis 44, 1953, 341–348.
- S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion (Engl. Transl. by A. E. Keep)*, New York 1992.
- H. G. Nesselrath, *Plutarch, On the daimonion of Socrates*, Tübingen 2010.
- R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I*, Oxford 1989.
- E. Pachoumi, *Divine Epiphanies of Paredroi in the Greek Magical Papyri*, GRBS 51, 2011a, 155–165.
- E. Pachoumi, *Resurrection of the Body in the Greek Magical Papyri*, Numen 58, 2011b, 729–740.
- E. Pachoumi, *Praying and Thinking. Religious and Philosophical Interactions in the Representations of the Abstract Deified Concept of Aion in Magical Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, Dionysius XXIX, 2011c, 171–180.
- E. Peterson, *Herkunft und Bedeutung der MONOS IPOΣ MONON-Formel bei Plotin*, Philologus 88, 1933, 30–41.
- K. Preisendanz and A. Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae Magicae – Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri. Vols. I–II*, Stuttgart 1973–1974.
- J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Related to the Old Testament*, Princeton 1969.
- J. M. Rist, *Plotinus and the Daimonion of Socrates*, Phoenix 17, 1963, 13–24.
- R. K. Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, Chicago 1993.
- J. M. Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, Leiden 1996.
- E. Rohde, *Psyche. The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, Hertford 1925.
- R. B. Rutherford, *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. A Study*, Oxford 1991.
- W. Scott, *Hermetica, Vol. I*, Oxford 1924.
- W. Scott, *Hermetica, Vol. IV*, Oxford 1936.
- R. Seaford, *Dionysiac Drama and the Dionysiac Mysteries*, CQ 31, 1981, 252–257.
- R. Seaford, *Pentheus' Vision. Bacchae 918–22*, CQ 37, 1987, 76–78.
- R. Seaford, *Euripides, Bacchae*, London 1997.
- G. Shaw, *Theurgy and the Soul. The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*, Pennsylvania 1995.
- A. Sheppard, *Proclus' Attitude to Theurgy*, CQ 32, 1982, 212–224.
- G. A. Smith, *The Myth of the Vaginal Soul*, GRBS 44, 2004, 199–225.
- J. Z. Smith, *Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity*, ANRW 2, 1978, 425–439.
- M. Smith, *The Hymn to the Moon, PGM IV 2242–2355*, in: L. Koenen et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology*, New York 1981.

- P. T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol. Ancient Readers at the Limits of Their Texts*, Princeton 2004.
- B. Tambrun-Krasker and M. Tardieu, *Μαγικά λόγια των από Ζωροάστρου μάγων. Γεωργίου Γεμιστού Πλήθωνος ἐξηγήσεις εἰς ἀντὰ τα λόγια*, Athens 1995.
- J. P. Vernant, *One ... Two ... Three: Eros*, in: D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality. The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton 1990, 465–478.
- G. Vlastos, *Theology and Philosophy in Early Greek Thought*, *PhQ* 2, 1952, 112–113.
- G. Watson, *The Stoic Theory of Knowledge*, Belfast 1966.
- A. Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, New York 2003.
- F. A. Wilford, *ΔΑΙΜΩΝ in Homer*, *Numen* 12, 1965, 217–232.
- R. H. Wilkinson, *Symbol and Magic in Egyptian Art*, London 1999.
- W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum and Other Libraries with English Translations and Notes, Amsterdam 1968.

Department of Classics
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Thessaloniki
GR 54124, Greece
elenipachoumi@hotmail.com

Abstract

The paper examines the religious and philosophical concept of the personal daimon in the Greek magical papyri in relation to Greek philosophy and especially to the Neo-Platonist philosophers. Questions to be addressed are: What is the nature of the personal daimon? What is the relationship between the personal daimon and the individual and how is this relationship established in magic? Special emphasis is placed on the role of the magico-theurgic ritual of systasis in the process of establishing the relationship with the personal daimon. Finally, the paper examines the relationship between magic rituals, mysteries and philosophy, focusing on the issue of the internalization of the personal daimon.

Keywords: personal daimon, systasis, theurgy, magic, philosophy